

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Engineering

Member: Tim Welch
Engineering Design Mgr.
Office Ph. 954-828-5123
Office Fax: 954-828-5275
Email: timw@cityfort.com

Project Name: J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Comments:

1. The architect's site plan should be supplemented with a location sketch similar to what's provided on the engineer's plans.
2. Owner of the referenced property is advised that no site plan approval shall be issued until said site plan reflects all easements, rights of way or encroachments recorded over this property. No building permit shall be issued until the City is supplied with a signed and sealed survey showing all above ground improvements, open and notorious evidence of encroachments, utilities or rights of way and all easements, rights of way and encroachments. This survey shall be based on an abstract of title dated no earlier than ninety (90) days prior to the date of building permit application. Copies of all relevant deeds or other documents evidencing those matters of title shown on the site plan and survey shall be provided to the City along with the survey, along with a copy of the title abstract. Additionally, an affidavit shall be provided by an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Florida attesting to no additional recordings of easements or encroachments from the remainder of time from ninety (90) days prior to the date of permit application to the date of issuance.
3. The owner shall provide a signed statement agreeing to satisfy all components of item 4 (above) prior to requesting final DRC authorization.
4. A photometric (lighting) plan is required in compliance with Section 47-20.14 of the City Code.
5. Dimension parking spaces and parking drive aisles in conformance with Section 47-20.11.
6. The architects shall review engineer's plans for existing and proposed utilities and eliminate any conflicts between proposed entrances/exits and power or street light poles, and any conflicts between landscaping and underground or overhead utilities.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Fire

Member: Albert Weber
954-828-5875

**Project
Name:** J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Comments:

1. Flow test required.
2. Show hydrant location
3. Corridor may not contain windows. Open air corridors must be fully open on one side or be rated. Also stairs must be shown to comply with NFPA 101, 7.2.2
4. Garage requires two legal exits.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Info. Systems

Member: Gary Gray
954-828-5762

**Project
Name:** J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Comments:

1. No apparent interference will result from this plan at this time.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Landscape

Member: Dave Gennaro
954-828-5200

**Project
Name:** J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Comments:

1. There are an insufficient number of trees on site to meet minimum Code requirements. There are 7 trees required for the “net lot area” and 1 for the vehicular use area. Note that existing trees to count must be healthy and well maintained.
2. Indicate requirements for irrigation, including the requirement for a rain sensor.
3. Make sure there are no sight triangle visibility obstructions.
4. All Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements apply. Note that “equivalent replacement” for trees removed to be above minimum site Code requirements.
5. Verify that all utilities that would affect proposed planting are shown on the Landscape Plan.
6. Signoff plans to be sealed by the Landscape Architect.

Recommendations:

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Planning

Member: Angela Csinsi
954-828-5984

Project Name: J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Request: Site Plan Level III/Six-Unit Multifamily Project with application of flexibility units/Employment Center Land Use

Comments:

1. This application will require application of flexibility units due to the property's land use designation of Employment Center. Provide a narrative stating how the flexibility criteria have been met (ULDR Sec. 47-28.1).
2. In order to apply flexibility units, this application shall be processed as a mixed-use project. See below from ULDR Sec. 47-18.21.E:

“E. Mixed use development (MXU) on employment center land use designated parcels. The city may permit a mixed-use development when the development site has an **employment center land use designation**, subject to the following:

1. Approval of an allocation of available flexibility units. For definition of flexibility units, see Section 47-28, Flexibility Rules.
2. The MXU includes residential uses in conjunction with the business uses as provided below in subsection F.3.
3. The residential floor area of the MXU does not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the gross floor area of the building; or
4. If the MXU is in the same building, business uses shall be limited to the floor(s) below the residential use; or
5. For a development site that is less than the ten (10) acres in size, single use residential buildings are permitted. No business uses are required; or
6. For a development site that is greater than ten (10) acres in size, single use multifamily buildings may be permitted provided gross residential acreage does not exceed the ten (10) acres or forty percent (40%) of the total gross acreage of the development site, whichever is greater.
7. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the ULDR to the contrary, the dimensional requirements for MXU on employment center designated land shall be governed by the dimensional requirements set forth in Sec. 47-6.20, Table of dimensional requirements, for the CB district.

DRC

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT

REPORT

3. Provide narratives for the following criteria: a) Mixed-use (as listed above); b) Neighborhood Compatibility (ULDR Sec. 47-25.3) and c) Adequacy Requirements (ULDR Sec. 47-25.2).
4. On the site plan, clarify or provide the following:
 - a) Label adjacent buildings, their uses and adjacent zoning districts;
 - b) Show right-of-way width of Miami Road;
 - c) On site data table, list number of units and density provided;
 - d) Will sidewalk dead end at existing Ficus tree? Does the sidewalk continue to property to the north?
5. Half the height of the building is required for side setbacks. Yard modification is required. This must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Board. Provide narrative explaining how this criteria is met if plans remain the same (ULDR Sec. 47-23.11).
6. Provide a floor plan showing dimensions of parking spaces instead of showing them on the civil plan.
7. The landscape plan includes letter “J” which is not listed in the Key. What does it refer to?
8. Provide North and South dimensions of elevation drawings. Include proposed colors and materials.
9. Respond to all DRC comments within 90 days or additional DRC review may be required.
10. Additional comments may be forthcoming at DRC meeting.

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division:	Police	Member:	Det. Gary J. Gorman 954-828-6421
Project Name:	J. Hamel	Case #:	125-R-03
Date:	December 9, 2003		

Comments:

1. Will impact resistant glass be used?
2. Will there be a security fence/gate at the underground parking garage entrance?
3. Will this fence/gate be electronically controlled by card access system? If not, how will access to project be controlled?
4. Will there be CCTV installed to monitor garage area, laundry room, elevator entrance, and stairwell areas?
5. Will there be a security gate located at the stairwell entrances in order to control access to and from the parking garage?
6. Are there any plans for visitor parking?
7. Will there be an emergency phone system installed in the parking garage?
8. Is there sufficient turning space in the parking garage?
9. All lighting should conform to standards set by the IESNA (Illumination Engineers Society of North America).
10. Will there be sufficient common area lighting in order to eliminate dangerous dark locations?
11. All entry doors and locking devices will have sufficient security rating.
12. Will the main entry doors to the units have a 180-degree viewing device installed? (Peep Hole)
13. Will each unit have a perimeter security system?
14. All landscaping should allow full view of location.
- 15. Please submit comments in writing prior to DRC sign-off.**

DRC
SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
REPORT

Division: Zoning

Member: Terry Burgess
954-828-5913

Project Name: J. Hamel

Case #: 125-R-03

Date: December 9, 2003

Comments:

1. Indicate grade as defined in section 47-2 on the site and elevation plans.
2. Dimension building height from grade as defined in section 47-2.
3. Provide a narrative outlining how the proposed multi-family development complies with the mixed-use criteria of section 47-18.21, Neighborhood compatibility 47-25.3 and Adequacy 47-25.2 point by point.
4. Provide the number of units and density permitted and proposed.
5. Provide the parking geometric pursuant to section 47-20.11.
6. Dimension the centerline of Miami Road on the site plan.
7. Site plan level III review is required.
8. Additional comments may be discussed at the DRC meeting.